

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/661,795	09/12/2003	Kenneth Peter Bowman	16-19-101 8351			
7590 01/31/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER		
Glenn P. Rick	cards	KATCHEVES, BASIL S				
DOWREY RIC	CKARDS PLLC					
Suite 106		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
19119 Norther	eek Parkway	3635	3635			
Bothell, WA 98011			DATE MAILED: 01/31/2005			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

					/ <i>b</i>		
<u> </u>		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)			
	Office Assign Summer	10/661,79	5	BOWMAN, KENNETH PETER			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
		Basil Kato	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3635			
Th Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communic	ation appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	dress		
THE MAIL - Extensions after SIX (6 - If the period - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC of time may be available under the provisions of MONTHS from the mailing date of this community of the reply specified above, it maximum statuely within the set or extended period for reply with eceived by the Office later than three months after them term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. f 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no eve nication. days, a reply within the statu tory period will apply and wil fill, by statute, cause the appli	int, however, may a reply be time story minimum of thirty (30) days Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ication to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely the mailing date of this co	/. ommunication.		
Status							
1)⊠ Res	sponsive to communication(s) filed	l on 12 September 2	003				
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the me							
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition o	of Claims						
4a) (5)	im(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are pending in the app Of the above claim(s) is/are im(s) is/are allowed. im(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected. im(s) is/are objected to. im(s) are subject to restriction	e withdrawn from cor					
Application F	'apers						
9) The	specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10) The	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	licant may not request that any objecti		•				
	lacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected to be				, ,		
Priority unde	r 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	nowledgment is made of a claim for b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority do Certified copies of the priority do Copies of the certified copies of application from the International he attached detailed Office action	ocuments have beer ocuments have beer f the priority docume al Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Application nts have been receive e 17.2(a)).	on Noed in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s)							
Attachment(s)	References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary ((DTO 442)			
2) 🔲 Notice of D	raftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC		Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te			
3) Information Paper No(s	n Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT s)/Mail Date	TO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal Pa	atent Application (PTO	-152)		

Art Unit: 3635

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,697,932 to Goodwin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,785 to Crook.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Goodwin discloses a method of finishing an opening by inserting a shim plate (16) with a top sill portion plate and frontal flange located between a framing member (12) and the periphery of a framing insert (32). Goodwin also discloses positioning a finishing material (38) on top of the sill and fastening it to the framing member (12) by use of a fastener (40) extending trough the shim plate. However, Goodwin does not disclose a foaming material injected between the frame member and shim plate. Crook discloses a foaming insulation for window frames (72) between the sill (20) and framing member (66). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Goodwin by adding a foaming insulation below the shim plate, as disclosed by Crook, in order to better insulate the window frame.

Regarding claim 2, Goodwin discloses the sill portion as inserted into a slot of the framed member (16 & 32).

Regarding claim 3, Goodwin in view of Crook discloses the use of plastic for the shim plate (Crook, column 6, lines 34-36). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Goodwin by using plastic for the shim plate, as disclosed by Crook, in order to save weight and resist corrosion when a lighter insert is used.

Regarding claim 5, Goodwin in view of Crook discloses a foaming insulation, but does not specifically claim the foam as being low-expansion. However, it would be obvious to one in the art to use a low-expansion foam in a situation that required a small area to be filled, rather than a high-expansion foam which would be needed to fill a large space. In this situation, there is a small area below the shim plate of Goodwin and of Crook and therefore it would have been obvious to use a low-expansion foam.

Regarding claim 6, Goodwin discloses the sill portion as being perpendicular to the insert and the end portion of the sill as being in contact with the periphery of the framed member (fig. 3: 36).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 2,697,932 to Goodwin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,802,785 to Crook further in view of U.S Patent No. 2,800,956 to Xanten.

Regarding claim 3, Goodwin in view of Crook do not disclose the use of a steel L shaped sash. Xanten discloses the use of a steel L shaped sash (line 31, fig. 1: 15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Goodwin in view of Crook, by using steel for the sash, as steel is

Application/Control Number: 10/661,795

Art Unit: 3635

known in the art to be stronger than aluminum and may be used in situations using heavier inserts.

Conclusion

Page 4

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited patents listed on the included form PTO-892 further show the state of the art with respect to frame inserts in general.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (703) 306-0232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (703) 308-0832.

BK

Basil Katcheves

1/25/05

Examiner AU 3635